

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Special Meeting
Tuesday, March 15, 2016
Clifford B. Green Meeting Center
69 South Main Street
6:30 p.m.**

MINUTES

I. Call to Order – Chair, Carlene Kelleher, called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

II. Roll Call – Carlene Kelleher; Michelle Sigfridson; Aaron Kerouac; Alan Carpenter; David Fuss; Dale Thompson; Jules D’Agostino; Jeryl Mohn; Rick Ives, *Exofficio*. Craig Dunlop was absent with notice.

Staff Present – Jana Roberson, Director of Community Development.

III. Seating of Alternates

Motion by M. Sigfridson to seat J. D’Agostino as a voting member in the absence of C. Dunlop. Second by A. Carpenter. Motion carried unanimously (6-0).

IV. Public Commentary – There were no comments from the public.

V. New Public Hearings:

Reading of Legal Notice – Read by A. Kerouac.

- 1. ZRC16-001 Brooklyn Sand and Gravel LLC;** Zoning regulation change to request to amend Article 13 Gravel Banks; Modify Sec. 13.5.4.2, add new Sec. 13.5.4.3 to allow gravel bank sites with frontage on a state highway to propose increased percentage of imported material for processing from 50-100% and renumber subsequent sections.

David Held, Professional Engineer/Land Surveyer, Provost & Rovero, represented the Applicant and wanted to ensure that all Commission Members had a copy of the March 8, 2016, revision to the proposed text amendment. It had been included in the packets to the Commission Members. Mr. Held clarified, for the public in attendance, that the proposed text amendment would apply to the entire Town of Brooklyn and that they are not proposing anything specific to a particular site or use. The Regulation change would be followed-up with something more specific that would deal with a particular site.

Mr. Held did a presentation and explained that there were a couple of preliminary discussions with the Commission, regarding the avenue to take, to allow processing of sand and gravel on a site in a more exclusive manner than what is currently allowed by the Regulations. The text amendment to Section 13.5.4 would allow the Commission, for a particular site that has footage on a State highway and use that frontage to access the site, to approve an increased percentage of imported material up to and including 100 percent.

Mr. Held addressed how the Application meets the requirement of being consistent with the POCD:

- Allows for retaining existing business in Town;
- Would put the Town of Brooklyn on equal footing with surrounding towns that allow processing as a stand-alone use (i.e. Plainfield and Killingly);
- Conserves natural resources and open-space/undeveloped land. Right now, 50 percent of material for processing must be extracted from the site where the processing is located. This could force someone into opening up an excavation on a site simply so they can have more processing volume to supply the actual materials they need to run the business. Mr. Held had submitted a letter (dated January 29, 2016) explaining the specific need of Brooklyn Sand & Gravel, LLC and their purpose for applying.

If a site has excavating and processing set-up, that land disturbance is already done. There is a need to restore the site when the work is done, but you still have an active site and it is an established part of the area it is in. Mr. Held feels there is value, conservation wise, to keeping it in the location where the infrastructure is established and the traffic patterns are established in a manner that the Town has already approved;

Mr. Held addressed truck traffic:

- He explained that the special permit process would allow the Commission to maintain control over truck traffic. If a business is forced to move out of Brooklyn and it relocates to a surrounding town where processing is allowed as a use by right, and if materials are imported using a route that goes through Brooklyn, the Town of Brooklyn would not have a say.

Mr. Held addressed a concern of the Town Land-Use Attorney, Peter Alter, regarding defining the term “material.” Mr. Held feels that it is defined, in a round-about way, in the existing Gravel Regulations in Section 13. They are not proposing to interject a new term that does not already exist in that Regulation, but if more clarification is required, they would provide it.

Mr. Held addressed a second concern of Town Land-Use Attorney, Peter Alter, regarding creating a completely different use that does not fit in with the Gravel Bank Regulations. Mr. Held stated that he sees some merit to that argument, however, before starting the process and before preliminary discussions he had discussed that issue with Jana Roberson and Martha Fraenkel and it was concluded that processing of sand and gravel does not fit the intent of the Industrial Regulations which talk to the manufacturing and processing of goods and materials. He feels that clarifies that they are not creating a new use and that this is the appropriate place to put it.

J. Roberson stated that she had sent the proposal and a re-write of the proposal which she had modified into a format that was more in keeping with the Zoning Regulations than the initial proposal. She relayed Attorney Alter’s comments:

- He is concerned that if the material is 100 percent imported, would it still be a gravel permit? He feels that it is more of a new industrial use rather than an accessory use to a gravel permit. It seems to be a transition to a completely separate use unrelated to the original permit and he sees it as a new use that should be separately permitted.
- Imported materials must be clearly defined. Asphalt millings or construction debris might be interpreted as imported materials and they have their own environmental concerns and are not adequately addressed in the Gravel Bank Regulations.

J. Roberson clarified why she feels that the Regulation change of 100 percent processing of materials is not a permitted use in the Industrial Zone except as what might be allowed under a modified version of gravel permits.

J. Roberson had suggested that the Applicant consider narrowing the proposal or defining imported materials to at least cover native sand and gravel. Truck traffic is adequately covered by the existing gravel special permit. She explained that if this proposal were adopted, they would need to apply for a special permit for the importation of materials above 50 percent.

J. D'Agostino asked Mr. Held to give specific information regarding the economic section of the POCD. Mr. Held answered:

- Page 8 - Goal of balancing the Grand List between residential, commercial and preserved lands;
- Page 21 – Retention of existing businesses as most important goal as it relates to Economic Development;
- Page 22 – Residential outweighs other development;
- Under Objectives, #5- Retaining and growing existing businesses remains critical to the economic health of Brooklyn;
- Page 23, #9 – The appropriateness of zoning district designation of the Industrial Zone located between Route 6 and South Street – Quasi Industrial Use;
- Finance Section regarding balancing the key municipal services with maintenance of the lowest realistic property tax mill rate.

M. Sigfridson asked Mr. Held to address Attorney Alter's contention that once you are importing 100 percent of your material, the site is no longer a gravel bank under the Regulations. Mr. Held stated that is for the Commission to decide than for him to defend and that it is based on guidance from Staff. They are open to suggestions for ways to see it more controlled or more defined. He asked the Commission Members to keep in mind that it is a resource-driven use.

A. Kerouac asked if 100 percent importing is allowed, where is the natural end of that use? Or, is it indefinitely open. Mr. Held stated that as long as they are operating within the special permit approval, they could continue as long as they wanted to. When sources are exhausted and it is no longer economically viable to import material from a longer distance, the processing use goes away and, as part of any special permit approval, you would want to see some sort of restoration/end use for the property particularly if it was historically used for a gravel operation.

A. Kerouac stated that the Commission should re-think the entire bonding process.

C. Kelleher commented that there is a strong argument to pay attention to Attorney Alter's suggestion that it may be better as a separate use. A gravel bank does have an end in sight, a processing operation doesn't necessarily. She also clarified that the Regulations state that imported material cannot exceed what is mined on site.

R. Ives stated that it is important to look at this as a way to keep a business going, but it is a totally new use. He stated that the Town of Brooklyn did not do everything it should have done.

For defining material, M. Sigfridson suggested substituting sand and gravel in place of material in every instance in Section 13.5.4. Mr. Held stated that this would accomplish what the Applicant is looking to accomplish, but he is not sure how it would fit in with other operators. C. Kelleher pointed out that it refers only to processing.

Karen Johnson, 1819 Upper Maple Street in Killingly, spoke in opposition on behalf of Don and Muriel Surprenant of 21 Maynard Road who have been concerned about the impacts of the various gravel operations in Town for the past twenty years. She provided copies of her letter (dated March 14, 2016) to the Brooklyn Planning & Zoning Commission. Ms. Johnson stated that she had been the Planner for the Town of Brooklyn in the past and has stayed involved in this issue because of her relationship with the Surprenants and the Trahans. She complimented the current Staff, Jana Roberson and Martha Fraenkel, for doing a fantastic job.

Ms. Johnson stated that, while Brooklyn Sand & Gravel and Jolley Concrete are great businesses and great for the region, it is not a matter of what is right at that particular location because it has been a problem property and, as everyone knows, has probably been operating as a processing facility for a number of years. The fact that the rationale for the regulation change ties to that property/business invites discussion. She stated that the environmental impact of truck traffic Maynard Road is relevant to this discussion. Ms. Johnson is in agreement with Attorney Alter's comment that the regulation change would change the land use. She stated that the Commission should look at where the current gravel bank permits are, where they are likely to be based on soil type, and where the State highways are. This would be involving only one or two properties which are identified as having significant environmental resources. She asked the Commission to consider Brooklyn Sand & Gravel's entire renewal file (which dates back to the mid 1980's) as part of the record for this discussion. She noted that violations on this property date back to 1990. She stated that by trying to accommodate one particular applicant, the Commission may be inviting a problem in another area. She stated that, in 2007, Brooklyn Sand & Gravel had presented an almost identical request for a text amendment.

Ms. Johnson suggested that the Applicant hire a professional planner, perhaps the same planning consultant that is working for the Town, to come up with a comprehensive re-write that works for the Town.

Maurice Lapierre, 534 Wauregan Road, wanted to clarify the truck traffic issue. He stated that Mr. Jolley goes above and beyond for truck traffic. They go all the way around on State roads to excavate gravel on the other part of town. There are other trucks going up Maynard Road that are not Mr. Jolley's.

Mr. Held asked that the discussion be kept to the text amendment rather than to the Brooklyn Sand & Gravel site on Route 205 or a specific use or application. Mr. Held addressed comments made:

- The site is 65 acres, so it is not a 20 acre spot zone. They are not applying for a zone change.
- House sites may ultimately be restored.
- The restoration method is suitable for agricultural use.

Paul Butters, 594 Wauregan Road, stated that, when getting his mail, he almost got hit multiple times by trucks that come flying around the corner. The State police have been sitting at both ends, possibly issuing tickets. He stated that the gravel pit is behind him and processing could be non-stop for another 50 years.

Wayne Jolley, 524 Wauregan Road, stated that their trucks have not gotten one ticket for speeding in the 30+ years they've been there. They have approximately 70 acres and have only disturbed 20 acres, so they have 50 acres they can still dig on for many years to come. He stated that he has an agreement with the Town and is being made to go around and not by the houses of the people who are complaining. Gravel from Neiman's, Solomon's, Langevin's, and Regis went to Jolley and they reclaimed them and there was no problem. He doesn't know of having had any problem with any Brooklyn Zoning Regulations.

Mr. Butters stated that he lives two houses down from the sand and gravel entrance and that there are trucks going in and out of the pit all day. He said that the loads are covered now, since the last meeting where that had been discussed.

Mr. Lapierre addressed the comments of Mr. Butters:

- He said that the trucks always have their loads covered, that is law;
- He stated that there are no citations from CT State Police or DOT for any of Mr. Jolley's dump trucks. He said that they are 100 percent compliant with DOT standards.

Austin Tanner, 19 Purvis Road, stated that the Commission should keep in mind that this is a text amendment and that every comment seems to be about Brooklyn Sand & Gravel (which is not the issue here).

C. Kelleher explained that although it is not about Brooklyn Sand & Gravel, the language states that the gravel bank must have frontage on a State road which narrows down what this could apply to. She does not want to mislead people.

A. Kerouac pointed out that Ms. Johnson spoke of more than just truck traffic. He asked Mr. Held to explain how this text amendment would apply to sites other than the Brooklyn Sand & Gravel site.

Mr. Held stated:

- The text amendment submitted was as broad as they could make it within reason. They don't feel it is appropriate to allow processing without excavation on a site without being on a State highway (other roads, such as Maynard Road, would need serious upgrades);
- During preliminary discussion, they had come in with a more narrow scope for text amendment than submitted and the intent was to narrow it to this one, single property. He stated that the Commission felt that was not the most appropriate way to do it. They chose to submit a more broadened scope because the Commission could approve it and narrow it down.

Dale Lyon, 133 Wauregan Road, spoke in favor and stated that he lives where Jolley's trucks travel and commented that the drivers are very courteous, drive within the speed limit, they are all late model, well maintained vehicles. He complemented the drivers present in the audience. Mr. Lyon said that he lives on a State road and expects to see trucks on his road. He said that he wished that trucks from Staples and others from other Towns would operate as Jolley's do.

D. Fuss stated that he is looking at this only as a text amendment as it stands, not for a specific site. He is looking at how it would affect any other site or potential application that may come before the P&Z Commission.

A. Carpenter stated that he agrees with D. Fuss and that any gravel/processing operation that may occur from this text amendment, if adopted, would require special permit.

A. Kerouac stated that he does not think that it just easily slips right in. He would like to see a different handling of buffer zones. He feels that the buffer zone for a gravel operation would not be adequate for processing.

M. Sigfridson commented that it would not be adding processing, but just changing where the material being processed is coming from.

C. Kelleher stated that they should think of it in broader terms and, if allowing the use of processing, they may want to establish some buffer zones. She referred to Attorney Alter's comment regarding adding a new stand-alone use in the RA Zone. She feels that the Commission should not rush into this and she suggested that the Commission Members take time to read Ms. Johnson's letter.

A. Carpenter suggested adding buffering during the special permit process if there is a change of use on a property. He also noted that the Commission has 35 days to consider this without an extension.

Dale Thompson stated that he does not want to rush and that, based on the number of people present and testimonies given, there will be an impact no matter what decision is made. He agrees

with C. Kelleher and would like to look into the exact wording of the change before the Commission makes a decision.

J. D'Agostino stated that, in the past, the Commission has pieced things together as needed. He feels that this does not fit the Regulations. It is a new use. He feels that it should wait for the re-write of the Regulations.

Mr. Held stated that the Commission will be finding things that they did not anticipate (dotting I's and crossing t's) for the first two years with the new regulations. He stated that with the special permit process, if something doesn't fit as proposed, you can say no to it, or you can put conditions on it so that it does fit.

J. D'Agostino prefers to wait the two years.

Discussion ensued.

C. Kelleher polled the Members of the Commission to see if they prefer to act on or to table until the next meeting: D. Fuss – Table; D. Thompson – Table; J. Mohn – Table; A. Carpenter – Table; M. Sigfridson – Table; C. Kelleher – Table; J. D'Agostino - Table; A. Kerouac – Table.

Mr. Held asked, if the Application is tabled, is there additional information that the Commission Members would like him to provide. D. Fuss stated that he would like to know the abutting zones. A. Kerouac mentioned a regulation for decibel levels. Mr. Held stated that it is essential to make this palatable to the Commission and to the public they would have to abide. J. Roberson recommended that, if it is continued, the Commission Members read Article 13 because some concerns/questions may already be addressed in the Regulations.

A. Kerouac asked about a recent permit renewal and if the Applicant has anything pending before another Commission. Mr. Held stated that there will be an application before Wetlands for Brooklyn Sand & Gravel site soon which is tied in with the renewal for the special permit. J. Roberson stated that there was a renewal granted today with a lot of conditions attached (one of which is going back to the Wetlands Commission).

Karen Johnson clarified that she is a Planner, not an attorney. She stated that you need standards and criteria to support your position on a special permit. The problem with the proposed text change is that you have inappropriate standards and criteria for what they are asking for. She asked that the Applicant withdraw the request and wait for the Town to go through an appropriate planning process.

There was discussion regarding how the Applicant came to apply for a text change.

Motion by D. Fuss to continue the public hearing for Application ZRC 16-001 Brooklyn Sand & Gravel LLC – Zoning regulation change request to amend Article 13 Gravel Banks: Modify Sec. 13.5.4.2, add new Sec. 13.5.4.3 to allow gravel bank sites with frontage on a State highway to propose increased percentage of imported material for processing from 50-100%, and renumber subsequent sections to the next regular meeting of the Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on April 6, 2016, at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT. Second by D. Thompson.

There was discussion. C. Kelleher asked J. Roberson to come up with better language and to consider giving a recommendation to the Commission regarding what is in the best interest of the Town.

A. Kerouac asked how Martha Fraenkel, ZEO, is involved. J. Roberson stated that Mr. Kerouac will receive the report from Martha regarding the renewal that he had requested. Regarding this Application, she has received feedback from Ms. Fraenkel and her concerns were with potential impacts. Only one not being addressed in the Regulations – gravel banks and scenic areas.

Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

C. Kelleher called a brief recess at 8:11 p.m. to allow time for the room to clear before resuming. The meeting resumed at 8:15 p.m.

2. ZC16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex LLC; Zone boundary change request to rezone 71 Vina Lane and a portion of 121 Vina Lane (approximately 25 acres total) from RA (Residential-Agricultural) to VCD (Village Center District).

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, represented the Applicant and did a poster board presentation. Mr. Archer explained that there is interest in putting a remote control car club in one of the chicken coops which is not allowed in the RA Zone and is also not allowed in the Agricultural Re-Use Zone. By putting it in the VCD, it allows more leeway as to what the coops could be used as (two are being used as min-storage units).

Mr. Archer indicated where the boundary line would be and stated that it includes the mobile home.

J. Roberson did a Power Point orientation of the neighborhood, pointing out the abutting zones. She stated that this change is supported by the POCD – Land Use Policy Map. The area had been identified in 2011 as a potential expansion of the VCD.

Austin Tanner, 19 Purvis Road, asked how much would be left in the RA Zone.

Mr. Archer answered 14 acres.

A. Kerouac asked for clarification on how this zone change would impact the use of the chicken coops that the Commission recently made an exception for under Adaptive Re-Use.

C. Kelleher explained that it would be grandfathered. J. Roberson explained that Adaptive Re-Use is not zone specific. Discussion ensued regarding frontage. A. Kerouac feels that the variance received was not legal.

Mr. Archer stated that the Applicant proceeded on the guidance of the Commission. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Archer submitted to J. Roberson the certificate of mailing to the abutters.

Motion by D. Fuss to close Application ZC 16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex LLC- Zone boundary change request to rezone 71 Vina Lane and a portion of 121 Vina Lane (approximately 25 acres total) from RA (Residential-Agricultural) to VCD (Village Center District). Second by D. Thompson. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Motion by D. Thompson to move Agenda Item:

VI. 2. ZC 16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex LLC- Zone boundary change request to rezone 71 Vina Lane and a portion of 121 Vina Lane (approximately 25 acres total) from RA (Residential-Agricultural) to VCD (Village Center District)

to V. 3.

Second by D. Fuss. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

VI. Other Unfinished Business:

2. **ZC16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex LLC**; Zone boundary change request to rezone 71 Vina Lane and a portion of 121 Vina Lane (approximately 25 acres total) from RA (Residential-Agricultural) to VCD (Village Center District).

Motion by A. Carpenter to approve Application ZC 16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex LLC- Zone boundary change request to rezone 71 Vina Lane and a portion of 121 Vina Lane (approximately 25 acres total) from RA (Residential-Agricultural) to VCD (Village Center District). Second by D. Thompson. Motion carried (6-1). A. Kerouac was opposed.

Reason for approval: Consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development.

3. **SP16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex, LLC**; Special Permit application to allow Indoor Sports and Recreation use (remote control car club) at 71 Vina Lane. (Note: This application is contingent on the approval of the requested zone boundary change).

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, represented the Applicant and did a poster board presentation. Mr. Archer provided a pamphlet showing what the inside would look like.

Mr. Archer presented what is proposed on the outside:

- Concrete building 40' x 100'
- Existing concrete pad outside
- Fence along easterly side
- Existing paved parking area (approved with existing storage unit)
- Two gravel parking areas (indicated location)
- Hours of Operation – Thursdays - 4 p.m. to 10 p.m.
Fridays - 4 p.m. to 10 p.m.
Saturdays - Noon to 10 p.m.
Sundays - Noon to 10 p.m.
- Two existing poles with existing streetlights (indicated location) – well illuminated
- Two outside lights (indicated location)
- Hard surface parking area (indicated location) gravel based / 24 cars

Steve Winnik, Owner of C & S Sports and Hobby in Plainfield, and **Brad Pelletier**, Partner, gave a presentation: racetrack; family entertainment; birthday parties/social gatherings; rental cars; open to the public. Only electric RC cars.

Mr. Pelletier explained that, in the VCD, the term hobby shop would allow them to generate revenue to pay bills. Revenue would be generated by renting cars, selling parts, and track time. The term club (under Agricultural Re-Use of a Building) does not allow for that.

Mr. Winnik stated that people drive long distances because there isn't anything like this around here.

J. Roberson suggested that the Applicant change the application to show a use that is allowed in the Zone (Indoor Sports and Recreation) and that if they are adding a retail use, that would also need to be part of the application. She stated that the Commission may consider some limited sales as accessory to Indoor Recreation. M. Sigfridson noted that retail is allowed in the VCD.

Mr. Archer explained that the sales would all be RC based and he stated that they will modify the application. He stated that nothing will be visible from the road (deep into the woods), where parking will be is a field right now. Not visible from Route 205 or from School Street or Vina Lane. There will be no impact on Creamery Brook. He indicated a large tree line.

A.Carpenter asked that parking be addressed in the site data table. J. Roberson stated that lighting detail is needed.

A.Carpenter asked for the total number of people that could be at events and he asked about restrooms and water.

Mr. Archer stated that the existing building has water and he indicated where they will have two port-o-potties outside. He explained that there is an existing septic system and an existing bathroom in another building that they can open for people to use during special events. A. Carpenter asked that they get an approval letter from the Health Department regarding that situation.

Mr. Pelletier stated that other facilities in New England use port-o-potties.

Jules D'Agostino agreed with A. Carpenter about getting approval from NDDH. M. Sigfridson asked that the port-o-potties be shown on the plan.

A.Carpenter asked about signage. Mr. Archer stated that there is no signage proposed at this time and that, if they ever do want signage, they will submit for a permit.

A.Carpenter asked about food and dumpster/trash removal.

Mr. Pelletier stated that they would not be preparing any food and that Pizza would be ordered from a local pizza shop. Mr. Archer stated that he will show an enclosed dumpster pad on the plan and he indicated another location where there is an existing dumpster pad.

A.Carpenter stated that there is ample emergency access provided through Vina Lane. He asked about fire protection.

D. Thompson asked that an emergency service plan be provided. J. Roberson stated that it is the Fire Marshal's jurisdiction. There was discussion regarding injuries.

Mr. Pelletier stated that, although people do get hit by cars, there had never been an instance for an ambulance ride.

Mr. Winnik, stated that they will get the information to the Fire Chief.

J. Roberson gave a list of items needed:

- Parking Standards Table;
- Lighting Detail;
- Letter from NDDH;
- Maximum number of people at events;
- Signage;
- Trash Removal;
- Food served;
- Emergency Exits;
- Statement of Use as part of the Application.

Dan Langevin, one of the owners of the property, stated that he and his partners are committed to help the tenant (Applicant) because it helps the owners in the long term to make the best use of the property.

A.Kerouack asked for a parking (overflow) agreement for large events. He stated that it is easier to put parking staging on the lower parcel rather than clearing acres of brush. Mr. Archer stated that

there is room for 25 cars and that he could show a parking overflow area. J. Roberson stated that the maximum number of people needs to be determined.

J. Roberson explained to the Applicants that the Commission needs to thoroughly review the Application and that she wanted to make sure that the Application is complete because, should it be approved, it is binding.

Motion by D. Fuss to continue application SP 16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex LLC- Special Permit application to allow Indoor Sports and Recreation use (remote control car club) at 71 Vina Lane to the next regular meeting of the Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on April 6, 2016, at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT. Second by D. Thompson. Second by M. Sigfridson. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

VII. Other Unfinished Business:

Motion by A. Kerouac to table Agenda Items:

VI. Other Unfinished Business:

1. **ZRC16-001 Brooklyn Sand and Gravel LLC;** Zoning regulation change to request to amend Article 13 Gravel Banks; Modify Sec. 13.5.4.2, add new Sec. 13.5.4.3 to allow gravel bank sites with frontage on a state highway to propose increased percentage of imported material for processing from 50-100% and renumber subsequent sections. and
3. **SP16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex, LLC;** Special Permit application to allow Indoor Sports and Recreation use (remote control car club) at 71 Vina Lane. (Note: This application is contingent on the approval of the requested zone boundary change).
to the next regular meeting of the Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on April 6, 2016, at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT. Second by D. Thompson. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

1. **ZRC16-001 Brooklyn Sand and Gravel LLC;** Zoning regulation change to request to amend Article 13 Gravel Banks; Modify Sec. 13.5.4.2, add new Sec. 13.5.4.3 to allow gravel bank sites with frontage on a state highway to propose increased percentage of imported material for processing from 50-100% and renumber subsequent sections. Continued – see above.

2. **ZC16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex LLC;** Zone boundary change request to rezone 71 Vina Lane and a portion of 121 Vina Lane (approximately 25 acres total) from RA (Residential-Agricultural) to VCD (Village Center District). Approved – see above.

3. **SP16-001 Brooklyn Center Complex, LLC;** Special Permit application to allow Indoor Sports and Recreation use (remote control car club) at 71 Vina Lane. (Note: This application is contingent on the approval of the requested zone boundary change). Continued – see above.

VIII. Public Commentary – None.

IX. Adjourn

Motion by J. D'Agostino to adjourn at 9:07 p.m. Second by A. Carpenter. Motion carried unanimously (7-0)

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault
Recording Secretary